



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"It is difficult to a German to understand the ancient Irish language, because we have not an old Irish dictionary ; and I know not if the Vocabulary of Cormac is yet published or not. If you desire to have a copy of this Irish hymn, I shall send it to you, and you will oblige me very much if you please to return to me a literal translation."

I submitted the verse to Dr. O'Donovan, from whom I received the following translation :—

"Aidus magnus in protrahendo jejunium
Aidus hilaris in gaudiis solemnitatis ;
Ingenium peracutum, pulcherimum ;
De mirabilibus Hiberniae campestris."

Or, as he paraphrased it :—

"Aedh was ascetic during the fasts,
But joyous and merry during the festivals ;
His genius was sharp as a pin ; his face the fairest of men,—
In short, he was one of the wonders of the plain of Erin."

I wrote back to Mone, enclosing the above translation, but the remainder of the poem has not yet arrived.

The little composition which forms the leading subject of the paper which you have now done me the favour to listen to, possesses no literary merits, but it is a well-defined trace of that early religious emigration which commenced in the sixth century, and waxed more and more vigorous till it attained its height in the ninth, taking with it not only the language and literature of the Scotti, but also their legendary associations, which they clung to in foreign climes ; and not only so, but left them on record in manuscripts which have weathered a thousand years, and are now beginning, through German industry, to be reflected on the mother country, where they find their counterparts, after a separation of so many centuries.

JOHN ROBERT KINAHAN, M. D. T. C. D., read the following paper—

ON A PROPOSED SCHEME FOR A UNIFORM MODE OF NAMING TYPE-DIVISIONS.

THE present system of names for types and type-divisions labours under the disadvantages of uncertainty of value in terms, and cumbersomeness of detail. Scarcely any two authors employ the same group-name in the same signification. One term is often found to be used for divisions of very unequal value, not merely as to absolute perfection or extent, but also as regards the mutual dependence and sequence of the divisions, and their relation to other types. The terms used, also, are too numerous, every division, no matter what its extent, being represented by a distinct name, and these names being merely of arbitrary signification, and in no ways expressing the relation of the groups to one another.

This, probably, has arisen from the transference to a natural system of the machinery of a system which was, for the most part, artificial, and in which, as a matter of course, it was of extreme moment that the divisions should be of equal extent.

Whilst this transfer was going on, and whilst the minds of even the advocates of a natural system were, so to speak, in a transition state, systematists found it extremely hard to divest themselves of the idea of a necessity for an equality in the groups, in the number of their subdivisions and types; and hence hastily applied the same terms to very unequal groups. For instance, in a natural system we may have two great groups of equal value in their relation to the same general archetype; whilst they may be most unequal as regards the number and general value of the more particular types contained beneath themselves.

I give an example. Suppose that by the terms "class," "order," "family," we express the following relations:—

Class.—A number of types agreeing in their general plan, but differing in the details of that general plan.

Order.—A number of types, which, agreeing among themselves in many particular details, yet differ in other particular but minor points; and which agree in general detail with those orders comprised with them under the same class.

Family.—A number of groups of types, which, agreeing in the general plan of the order, yet differ among themselves in certain still more particular characters.

Now every one who has examined in detail the types of a natural system knows that, owing to the mode in which the archetypes and types have been developed in time, as at present known, none of our groups of major extent comprises the entire of the types which might be imagined to make it up. Under one class, for instance, we will find four or five groups answering to our idea of order; and under these orders, probably, as many families; whilst under another class, we meet with, perhaps, but one group of ordinal value, the characters which distinguish its subdivisions being of such minor importance as not to justify us in considering them of higher grade than those divisions which we called families in the class first alluded to. Systematists, however, in too many instances, through forgetfulness of this fact, have, in such cases as I have last described, applied to these minor groups the same term as they applied to the more important groups in the former case, and hence a system of looseness in the application of terms has arisen, which leads to much confusion and embarrassment, especially among students in the science.

The employment of a distinct arbitrary term for each division has the further disadvantage of incumbering our class-books with a series of names, which, after all, have no fixed value, inasmuch as it is necessary, in the first place, to learn the exact sense in which the author uses them, before we can thoroughly understand their exact value in his writings.

Now it appears that the present nomenclature of type-divisions would be much simplified if writers of systems generally, taking a hint from what has been already accomplished in the practical working of systems in which groups of supposed equal value always have the same termination to their name, would, in the first place, abandon the use of the terms, *class*, *family*, *order*, *tribe*, *legion*, *cohort*, *kingdom*, *sub-king-*

dom, and a host of others, and adopt a scheme somewhat of this kind:—Let the *species*, as the most particular idea of a group of characters common to many, be called either *ultimate type* or *species*—though this latter term has now received such a wide range from the hands of some that there is danger of our particular knowledge of it being altogether lost. Let the most general type, that is to say, that under which all the other and more particular groups are comprised, be called *Archetype*; the group next in succession to the archetype being called *Primary Type*; the next, *Secondary Type*; and so on: the genus or group next to the ultimate type or species being called *Penultimate Type*, unless it were preferred to retain the name *Genus*, as this term is generally used correctly, and its position properly understood.

There would be no inconvenience in the number of terms required, because, at present, even in the most elaborate systems, there are but five grades of characteristic groups recognised beneath the archetype, viz.:—Class = Primary Type; Order = Secondary Type; Family = Tertiary Type; Genus = Penultimate Type, and Species or Ultimate Type. Sub-classes, sub-orders, sub-families, and sub-genera, would be represented as Primary Sub-Type, Secondary Sub-Type, and so on; whilst those modifications of species which are commonly called Varieties and Races would be represented as Ultimate Accidental Sub-Type, and Ultimate Cultivated Sub-Type. The subjoined Table will explain this more fully:—

PROPOSED NAMES.	EXAMPLE.	PRESENT NAMES.
	(1)	
Archetype.	Vertebrata.	Sub-kingdom.
Primary type.	Mammalia.	Class.
" sub-type.	Gyrencephala.	Sub-class.
Secondary type.	Artiodactyla.	Order.
" sub-type.	Omnivora.	Sub-order.
Tertiary type.	Suidæ.	Family.
" sub-type.	Suinæ.	Sub-family.
Penultimate type.	Sus.	Genus.
" sub-type.	Scrofa.	Sub-genus.
Ultimate type.		Species.
" cultivated sub-type.	, var. <i>domesticus</i> .	Variety.
	(2)	
Archetype.	Vertebrata.	Sub-kingdom.
Primary type.	Mammalia.	Class.
" sub-type.	Gyrencephala.	Sub-class.
Secondary type.	Proboscidea.	Order.
Tertiary type.	Elephantidæ.	Family.
" sub-type.	Elephantinæ.	Sub-family.
Penultimate type.	Euelephas.	Genus.
Ultimate type.	, <i>Indicus</i> .	Species.
" accidental sub-type.	, var. <i>Zeylandicus</i> .	Variety.

The advantages that would accrue from the use of this or some similar system are, first, the simplicity of the terms used; next, the fact that these terms declare, at once, the relative value, in the author's

ideas, of the several groups to which they are applied, and thus enable the reader to at once compare separate systems, and discover their differences; thirdly, the facility with which they enable a writer to state the difference between different systems of classification. To give an instance:—

According to some systematists, the sub-kingdom (*Archetype*) *Vertebrata* is divided into the classes (*Primary Types*), *Mammalia*, *Aves*, *Reptilia*, *Batrachia*, *Pisces*. According to others, this sub-kingdom (*Archetype*) is divided as follows:—Classes (*Primary Types*), *Mammalia*, *Birds*, *Hæmacrymes*. Of these, the class *Hæmacrymes* is again divided into the sub-classes—*Reptilia*, *Pisces*; the *Reptilia* being again divided into the orders (*Secondary Types*) *Batrachia*, *Ophidia*, &c. Now it is manifest that if, instead of stating that *Batrachia* was, according to some, a class of *Vertebrata*, and, according to others, only an order of the *Reptilia*, which was a sub-class of *Hæmacrymes*, a Vertebrate class, that we made the statement,—*Batrachia*, according to some, a Vertebrate primary type; according to others, a secondary Vertebrate type,—the exact relations between the values assigned by the two systematists would be at once understood; and this, I conceive, would be one great advantage of the proposed nomenclature, that, no matter how our ideas about the value of the groups themselves might vary, that of the value of the names would necessarily remain the same; all that would occur in case of a change in our ideas of the value of groups, being the transference of the group to a higher or lower division, as the case might be. It must not be thought that I claim any originality for this idea: the principle of it has been long recognised, as already stated, and the general idea of the necessity for a *definite* value to our divisional names will be found floating through all the later books of classification, a thing which, however, it appears, will be impossible as long as we use terms which by long-continued custom have come to be mere arbitrary names, without any definite connexion or mutual dependence on each other; and therefore, it would appear to be desirable to suppress them altogether, and substitute in their place others, the relationship between which is manifest, understood, and universally acknowledged.

Dr. E. Perceval Wright said that, without entering into the details of the paper just read by Dr. Kinahan, he still thought that one of the most important objects which a universal nomenclature had in view would be altogether nullified if any of the terms used would suggest ideas foreign to the nomenclature; that hence he would suggest that the word 'archetype' having been used by Professor Owen to represent an idea now familiar to all zoologists, it would not be advisable to have it appearing at the head of a new nomenclature with a very different idea attached to it. He would not occupy the Academy by entering into the merits or demerits of Dr. Kinahan's paper. If a satisfactory universal nomenclature was ever invented, it would be a very great boon, indeed, to the systematist, nor would it be without great benefit to the comparative anatomist also.

Dr. Kinahan said the term 'archetype' being objected to by some as already pre-occupied and used in a double sense, perhaps, if he might coin a word, that of 'holotype' might be advantageously used in its place.

THE VEN. THE ARCHDEACON OF ARDFERT read a—

REPORT OF AN OGHAM MONUMENT LATELY DISCOVERED ON THE SITE OF THE FIRST BATTLE RECORDED AS HAVING BEEN FOUGHT BY THE MILESIANS IN IRELAND.

It seems to me desirable to place before Irish antiquarians in general, and more especially those interested in Ogham investigations, some details respecting an Ogham monument lately brought under notice in a locality marked by very definite description in the legendary annals of Ireland. I need not enlarge upon the great question pending between Ogham authorities, as to whether these inscriptions are to be assigned to a date anterior or subsequent to the Christian era; to whichever side the preponderance of opinion may incline, I believe that it must be said "*ad huc sub judice lis est*;" and it will be conceded that a main part of the difficulty in arriving at any unquestionable conclusion arises from the fact, that while a considerable number of those monuments have, from time to time, been discovered, there is scarcely a thread of historic clue to guide the inquirer as to their meaning or chronologic relations. It is in this dearth of historic information that I am induced to invite attention to the discovery of an Ogham monument hitherto unnoticed, which, though lying in a locality intimately known to the late lamented Richard Hitchcock, escaped even the research of that enthusiastic investigator of Ogham remains, and which has now been brought to light in the very position in which a very circumstantial historic legend might lead the supporters of one of the theories respecting Ogham to expect that such a monument would be found. Being so found, I venture to hope, that under the examination of competent investigators, it may prove doubly interesting; first, as having light thrown upon its age and meaning by the legend referred to; and again, as possibly returning the obligation, by affording, in its mute but unquestionable record, a testimony which may tend to establish, among historic verities, statements which many, pretending to decide with all the authority of right reason, have, by a judgment more hasty than dispassionate, summarily dismissed to "the wild and pathless region of romance." (*Vide* Wood's "Ireland," p. 60.)

All who do not throw aside the remnants of Irish history which have come down to us as "bardic myths," consent to the tradition that the first landing of the Milesians in Ireland took place on the south-west coast of Kerry, in Munster; and it may here be observed, that this landing is supposed to have been effected in the very locality upon which a world-wide attention is now fixed, as the European point from which it has been ascertained that the flashing of intelligence between the New and Old World continents is an accomplishable fact. It was here that, as is calculated, about thirty centuries since, a tribe of the Scythians, after a sojourn in Spain, are recorded as having first made good a landing in